

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In this application, claims 27-36 are currently pending. Claims 1-26 have been cancelled. In the present response, none of the claims are amended.

Claims 27-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20050280502) in view of Sheha et al (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20030016804).

Applicant expresses appreciation to Examiner Khai Nguyen and SPE Vincent P. Harper for the courtesy of an interview, which was granted to Applicant's representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856). The interview was held in the USPTO on July, 30, 2008. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Interview Summary.

At the interview, claim 27 was discussed vis-à-vis the prior art of Bell. The Interview Summary states, in relevant part, "Applicant's representative stressed that the final limitation in claim 27, namely 'to enable communication between said first and second user via said first user's mobile communicator and said second user's mobile communicator' is not taught or suggested by Bell, and that Bell shows only data communication and not communication between the users as claimed. The Examiner maintains that further search and consideration is required, and that no agreement was reached."

Bell describes a system and method for obtaining information relating to a person without face-to-face, verbal or other contact. Sheha describes a system and method for providing real-time position information of one party to another party by utilizing a conventional telecommunication network system such as the conventional telephone network, a mobile telecommunications network, a computer network, or the Internet.

As discussed at the interview, claim 27 recites “said server additionally being operative, following provision to said first user of said personal information relating to said second user and provision to said second user of said personal information relating to said first user, to enable **communication between said first and second user** via said first user’s mobile communicator and said second user’s mobile communicator.” Bell shows, in a first embodiment, provision of personal information between a first mobile communicator and a second mobile communicator and, in a second embodiment, provision of personal information between a mobile communicator and a server.

Applicant respectfully submits that Bell does not show or suggest **“communication between a first and a second user via the first user’s mobile communicator and the second user’s mobile communicator”** as recited in claim 27. Rather, Bell shows provision of personal information between the communicators and not between the users. Additionally, Bell does not show or suggest a server **“operative, following provision to said first user of said personal information relating to said second user and provision to said second user of said personal information relating to said first user, to enable communication between said first and second user via said first user’s mobile communicator and said second user’s mobile communicator,”** as recited in claim 27. Rather, Bell shows provision of personal information and does not show or suggest any communication following provision of the personal information.

Applicant submits that none of the cited prior art, alone or in combination, shows or suggests an introductions system including, inter alia, a server operative, following provision to a first user of the personal information relating to a second user and provision to the second user of the personal information relating to the first user, to enable communication between the first and the second user via the first user’s mobile communicator and the second user’s mobile communicator, as recited in amended claim 27, and that claim 27 is therefore patentable.

Method claim 32 recites functionality similar to claim 27 and is therefore patentable. Claims 28-31 each depend from claim 27 and recite additional patentable

subject matter and are therefore patentable. Claims 33-36 each depend from claim 32 and recite additional patentable subject matter and are therefore patentable.

Applicant has carefully studied the remaining prior art of record herein and concludes that the invention as described and claimed in the present application is neither shown in nor suggested by the cited art.

Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims as filed in the context of a continuation application.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CLIFFORD J. MASS
LADAS & PARRY LLP
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10023
REG. NO.30,086 (212)708-1890